

-13-

POU920000087US1

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 were originally presented in the subject application. Claims 1, 18, 37 and 41 have hereinabove been amended, and claims 42-50 added, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. No claims have herein been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-50 remain in this case.

The addition of new matter has been scrupulously avoided. In that regard, support for the common amendment to claims 1, 18, 37 and 41 can be found in the specification at, for example, page 10, lines 5-8. In addition, new claims 42-45, 47 and 50 are merely independent versions of original claims 10, 30, 3, 20, 23 and 39, respectively; and claims 46, 48 and 50 are identical in content to original claims 21, 24 and 40.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the grounds of rejection and objection.

Objection to Specification/Drawings

The Office Action objected to the specification, requiring that references to pending patent applications on page 8 be updated to reflect the issuance thereof. In response, Applicants have updated the noted references.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4-19, 22, 25-38 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103, as allegedly obvious over Gregg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,651,033) in view of Mejia (U.S. Patent No. 6,680,970). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse this rejection as noted below.

Applicants have added claims 42 and 43, which are independent versions of claims 10 and 30, respectively. Both claims recite that the selected position of the data unit is a middle position.

-14-

POU920000087US1

Against claims 10 and 30 (now 42 and 43), the Office Action cites to FIG. 1 of Mejia, and alleges that "the data transition in the middle of pattern 12-fig.1 *could* be selected." (Emphasis added.) However, the Office Action cites to no section in the text of Mejia teaching or suggesting anything of the sort. In fact, Mejia teaches only the use of the leading and trailing data transition edges, and nothing in between.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 42 and 43 cannot be made obvious over Gregg et al. in view of Mejia.

Each of independent claims 1, 18, 37 and 41 has been amended in some fashion to indicate that the clock signal is obtained from a data unit having both data and clock information. Support for the common amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 10, lines 5-8.

In contrast, Gregg et al. teaches the clock signal on its own line (see, e.g., FIGs. 1 and 2 of Gregg et al.), and Mejia fails to remedy this deficiency (see, e.g., FIG. 7 of Mejia and the description thereof starting at column 9, line 36).

Therefore, Applicants submit that, as amended, none of the rejected claims can be rendered obvious over Gregg et al. in view of Mejia.

#### Objection to Claims

The Office Action objected to claims 3, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 39 for depending from rejected base claims. However, the Office Action also indicated that these claims would be allowable if amended in independent form, including all of the limitations of the relevant base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have herein added claims 44-50, with claims 44, 45, 47 and 49 corresponding to claims 3, 20, 23 and 39 in independent form, and including all of the limitations of the relevant base claims, and any intervening claims. Dependent claims 46, 48 and 50 correspond to claims 21, 24 and 40, respectively.

-15-

POU920000087US1

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 44-50 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit that the dependent claims not specifically addressed herein are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they directly or ultimately depend, as well as for their additional limitations.

Applicants acknowledge the references cited in the Office Action, but not substantively applied. However, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable thereover as well.

For all the above reasons, Applicants maintain that the claims of the subject application define patentable subject matter and earnestly request allowance of claims 1-50.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Wayne F. Reinke  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 36,650

Dated: July 26, 2004.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579